

IN THE DRAWINGS:

The attached Replacement Sheet (numbered 1/2) of drawings includes changes to Fig. 1. This Replacement Sheet, which includes Fig. 1, replaces the original drawing sheet which included Fig. 1. In amended Fig. 1, directional arrows have been added along lines 3, 10, and 20. Support for this change may be found at least at page 9, line 5 to page 10, line 20 of the specification.

REMARKS

The present application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated October 18, 2011. Claims 38, 40 to 44, 61, and 62 are presented for examination, of which Claims 38, 40, 61, and 62 are in independent form. Claim 38 has been amended. Claims 27 to 37, 39, and 45 to 60 have been previously withdrawn from consideration. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

The drawings were objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The Office Action states that the drawings do not show "the lamp operating device, receiving and interpreting the at least one command from the central control unit and the lamp operating device is constructed to operate the lamp independently based on both operational mode selected and at least one command received from a local control unit". A Replacement Sheet numbered 1/2 is submitted herewith. The Replacement Sheet includes changes to Fig. 1. Fig. 1 has been amended to include directional arrows along lines 3, 10, and 20. Support for this change may be found at least at page 9, line 5 to page 10, line 20 of the specification of this application. It is believed that the objection to the drawings has been remedied, and its withdrawal is therefore respectfully requested.

Claims 40 to 44, 61, and 62 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph. The Office Action states that the application does not provide an enabling disclosure for "at the lamp operating device, receiving and interpreting the at least one command from the local control unit and operating the lamp independently based on both the selected operational mode of the lamp operating device and the received command from the local control unit." Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections of Claims 40 to 44, 61, and 62, and submit that support for the aforementioned elements referred to in the Office Action may be found at least at page 9, line 5 to page 10, line 20 of the specification

of this application. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections of Claims 40 to 44, 61, and 62 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph.

In the Office Action Claims 38, 40 to 44, 61, and 62 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over U.S. Patent Application Publication 2006/0049935 (“Giannopoulos”). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections of those claims for at least the following reasons.

One feature of the lamp operating device of Claim 38 is that the lamp operating device is operable in one of a plurality of selectable operational modes. Another feature of the lamp operating device of Claim 38 is that the lamp operating device is constructed to receive at least one command for the selection and setting of the operational mode provided by a central control unit. Other features of the lamp operating device of Claim 38 include that the lamp operating device is also constructed to interpret at least one command provided by a local control unit and the interpretation of the command provided by the local control unit is based on the operational mode selected and set by the central control unit, to control the lamp. Thus, operation of the lamp is carried out on the basis of two commands: a command from the central control unit; and another command from the local control unit, the latter of which is used to operate the lamp in the selected operational mode of the lamp operating device.

Applicants submit that nothing has been found in Giannopoulos that discloses the above-identified subject matter of Claim 38.

In the rejections, the Office Action cites to paragraphs [0020], [0021], [0028], [0042], and [0044] of Giannopoulos. As understood by Applicants from those citations, the Office Action equates a central master ((CM), Fig. 1 of Giannopoulos) of Giannopoulos with the “central control unit” referred to in Claim 38. See, e.g., Office

Action at page 5, paragraph 7, lines 6 and 7. Also, the Office Action equates a local control master ((LCM), Fig. 1 of Giannopoulos) of Giannopoulos with the “local control unit” referred to in Claim 38. See, e.g., Office Action at page 5, paragraph 7, lines 7 and 8. The Office Action also equates a lighting unit (B, Fig. 1 of Giannopoulos) with the “lamp operating device” referred to in Claim 38. See, e.g., Office Action at page 5, lines 3 to 5.

However, the Office Action is respectfully disagreed with for the following reasons.

Giannopoulos relates to wireless-control of lighting systems. See, e.g., Giannopoulos at paragraph [0001]. As understood by Applicants, Giannopoulos’s central master (CM) is connected with the local control master (LCM). See, e.g., Giannopoulos at paragraph [0020]. Furthermore, the local control master (LCM) is connected with lighting units (B), sensors (S), and remote controls (R), where the lighting unit (B) could be constructed, for example, as shown in Fig. 2 of Giannopoulos. See, e.g., Giannopoulos at paragraphs [0021] and [0024].

The central master (CM) of Giannopoulos is not seen to transmit a command to the lighting units (B), through which one of a plurality of operational modes would be selected and set, nor is the local control master (LCM) seen to transmit any command to the lighting unit (B) through which an operational mode is selected. Accordingly, Applicants submit that Giannopoulos cannot disclose a lamp operating device that is constructed to interpret at least one command provided by a local control unit, and that the interpretation of the command provided by the local control unit is based on the operational mode selected by the central control unit, to control the lamp, as is provided for in Claim 38.

Furthermore, even if the local control master (LCM) is deemed for argument’s sake to correspond to a lamp operating device, Giannopoulos is not seen to

describe that the central master (CM) transmits a command to the local control master (LCM) through which an operational mode is selected and set.

Paragraph [0020] of Giannopoulos (relied on in the Office Action) refers to a choice that relates only to the type of link utilized for coupling each local control master (LCM) to the central master (CM). Therefore, such a choice is not seen to correspond to, anticipate, or render obvious a command for the selection and setting of an operational mode of the lamp operating device, let alone such a command as recited in Claim 38.

With regard to paragraphs [0042] and [0044] of Giannopoulos relied on in the Office Action, those paragraphs refer to a normal mode and an association mode of the remote control (R). As understood by Applicants, the remote control (R) of Giannopoulos is normally operated in the normal mode and the association mode is used merely to activate a control element on the remote to effect selection of a lighting unit with the control element. Therefore, the normal and association modes are not seen to correspond to a command for the selection and setting of an operational mode of the lamp operating device, let alone such a command as that recited in Claim 38.

Indeed, it is respectfully submitted that nothing has been found, or pointed out, in Giannopoulos, that is believed to disclose or suggest a lamp operating device that is operable in one of a plurality of selectable operational modes, wherein the lamp operating device is constructed to receive a command for the selection and setting of the operational mode provided by a central control unit, and to interpret at least one command provided by a local control unit, the interpretation being based on the operational mode selected and set by the central control unit, to control the lamp, as set forth in Claim 38.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that Claim 38 is allowable over Giannopoulos, and respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of that claim under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

Independent Claim 40 recites features that are similar in many relevant respects to those discussed above with respect to Claim 38, and is believed to be allowable over Giannopoulos for at least the same reasons as discussed above in connection with Claim 38. Also, independent Claims 61 and 62 are a system and apparatus claim, respectively, and recite features similar in many relevant respects to those discussed above with respect to Claims 38 and 40. Claims 61 and 62 are thus believed to be patentable over Giannopoulos for at least the same reasons as discussed above in connection with Claim s 38 and 40.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections of independent Claims 40, 61, and 62.

The other claims in this application depend from one or another of the independent claims discussed above, and, therefore, are submitted to be patentable over Giannopoulos for at least the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, individual reconsideration of the patentability of each claim on its own merits is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration and early passage to issue of the present application.

No petition to extend the time for response to the Office Action is deemed necessary for the present Amendment. If, however, such a petition is required to make this Amendment timely filed, then this paper should be considered such a petition and the

Commissioner is authorized to charge the requisite petition fee to Deposit Account 06-1205.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa, California office by telephone at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

/ Christian Mannino /
Christian Mannino
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 58,373

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
1290 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10104-3800
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200